

Docket No. RR2667 / 26162.4

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-20, and 22-24 have been rejected. Claims 3, 11, and 21 have been objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but deemed to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant appreciates the noted allowability of these claims if rewritten.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-20, and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sahai (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699) (hereafter "Sahai"). Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-20, and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sahai. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The PTO provides in MPEP § 2131:

*"[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...."*

Therefore, to sustain this rejection, Sahai must contain all of the claimed elements of claims 1,2, 4-10, 12-20, and 22-24.

Claim 1 recites, in part: "creating a plurality of state objects at the HTTP client[.]" (emphasis added). The Examiner argues that this limitation is found in Sahai at column 3, lines 64-67. The Examiner attempts to equate "client's capabilities and user preferences" with the state objects as recited in the claim. Initially, applicant notes that the cited portion of the Sahai reference does not discuss user preferences at all, but merely discusses the client capability being specified in a flat file which resides on the client machine. In any event, the client capabilities of Sahai are not the same as the state objects as claimed in the present invention.

In the present application, the term "state objects" (or "cookies") is discussed in the specification (see, e.g., p. 1, line 10 – p. 2, line 19, and p. 5, line 17 – p. 6, line 24) as typically including a name attribute, an expiration attribute, a domain attribute, a path attribute, and an attribute requesting transmission using a secure channel. The client capabilities discussed in Sahai do not include these attributes. Sahai is concerned with the capabilities of a client to handle the demands of media-on-demand multimedia streaming data, such as processor speed

Docket No. RR2667 / 26162.4

and multimedia encoders. Sahai is not concerned with the state objects, or "cookies," associated with transferring information between a HTTP client and a HTTP server, as discussed in the present invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would not read the client capabilities of Sahai as being the same as the state objects as claimed in the present invention. Thus, Sahai does not teach creating a plurality of state objects at the HTTP client, as claimed in claim 1 of the present application, and therefore does not anticipate claim 1. Independent claims 7, 15, 16, 17, and 18 have similar claim limitations, and are likewise not anticipated by Sahai.

Claim 1 also recites that the plurality of state objects be stored on the HTTP client prior to an initial interaction with the HTTP server. The Examiner cites column 3, lines 64-67, for this limitation. There is nothing in the passage that indicates that anything is stored on the HTTP client prior to an initial interaction with the HTTP server. Therefore, this limitation has not been proven by the Examiner to be taught by Sahai. Claim 7, and the claims that depend from it, have a similar limitation, and are likewise not anticipated by Sahai.

Claims 2-6, 8-14, and claims 18-24, depend from and further limit their respective independent claims, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims.

Accordingly, a formal notice of allowance of claims 1-24 is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below if further consideration is required.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Witcher, III  
Senior IP Counsel, Nortel Networks  
Registration No. 39,877

Pursuant to  
37 CFR 1.34

Reg. No. 39,877

Date: June 21, 2005  
Nortel Networks  
PO Box 13828, RTP, NC 27709-3828  
Telephone: 919/997-3479  
Facsimile: 919/997-6659

<b>CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION</b>	
I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted via facsimile to 703-872-9306 on June 21, 2005 to:	
Examiner: <u>Moustafa Meky</u> Art Unit: <u>2157</u>	
<u>Rhonda Spivey</u>	
9	Name of Sender
<u>Rhonda Spivey</u>	
Signature	